

Above illustration based on **Rembrandt** van Rijn's 1642 *Militia Company of District II under the Command of Captain Frans Banninck Cocq*, also known as *The Shooting Company of Frans Banning Cocq and Willem van Ruytenburch*, but commonly referred to as *The Night Watch* (Dutch: *De Nachtwacht*).

0/

Therefore, it is sensible *that* she champion a *new crusade against Muslims!* But, the outcry of a few frog-mouth ignoramuses belly-aching against Goldy's upcoming appearance led Laurier to make a public statement promising to provide an "environment for respectful debate and [encourage] members of the university community to

allow these debates to take place in a manner that is free of disruption.”

Both Duchesne and Goldy were going to speak about the on-going perpetuation of *ethnocide*, *multiculturalism* and *cultural identity*, but *she* was viciously bullied by asinine reactivists, including **Antifa**, which ended the night by *pulling the fire alarm*.

Antifa is a coalition of *autonomous* left-wing bully gangs - autonomous only because these spoilt brats hide their faces (and identities) when behaving ritually anti-social and riotous, them knowing full well how in the wrong they truly be; but these stiff-necked jejunes commit cowardly acts of terror and mob violence bethinking thaim free of *any* social responsibility in invoking a phony claim of *civil disobedience*.

Note: These post-pubescent punks are quick to point fingers and/or to employ *weaponized words* to manipulate the *hoi polloi* (i.e. *mobbish crowd*) into noisily invoking their *subliminated hive mind mentality* preprogramming. *The same process is employed in Africanizing peaceful colonies of bumblebees.*

“Hey-hey... ho-ho...: White supremacy-s’ got to go!”

The protest was a scene completely divorced from any kind of reality: Hanging from a nearby building was a big White sheet with ominous black paint that read “Laurier enables White supremacy.” About 100 demonstrators carried signs that asserted “No Nazis at Laurier.” “Not on my campus,” “Against neo-Nazism” and “Your definition of freedom of speech is hate speech.”

“Hey hey! Ho ho! White supremacy s’got to go!” the gender-ambiguous speaker yelled into the microphone.

Shepherd had tweeted Laurier *had* “refused to accommodate our event.” Laurier officials said there wasn’t enough time to plan the event properly.

“Well, University of Waterloo didn’t seem to have a problem working with us and getting this event together in under a week, figuring out security arrangements and everything,” Shepherd said on Twitter.

Well the LSOI rescheduled the event but this time the organizers decided to rent a space down the road at University of Waterloo. The **Faculty Association of the University of Waterloo** set up a fundraiser to support *multiculturalism* on the campus in response to the event with an intended goal to give campus and community members a meaningful way to signal their support for indigenous and racialized members of the UW community. The LSOI organizers got an estimate of fourteen hundred dollars (\$1400.00) to rent the space... and twas expected it would cost *approximately* fourteen hundred dollars (\$1400) for security...

So the event went forward. Coordinators started promoting the event and selling tickets but within a few passing days the security cost went up about ten times the amount - a whopping twenty eight thousand dollars (\$28,000). Thus, with the cost of security becoming unaffordable to organizers, the event was canceled.

Raising security fees is a sabotage tactic.

When it comes to a controversial speaker with an unpopular opinion university campuses are willing to shut down “free speech” whilst, at the same time, encouraging protest (viz. *civil unrest*)!

Section 2 of the Canadian Charter mentions our fundamental freedoms, including freedom of thought and expression. *as well as* peaceful assembly: Note - this does not infer any bequest of natural rights... merely that the

government-issued document is a statement of fact by *that* government recognizing the natural rights of free-born persons of the land - and theoretically it applies to everyone living under a democracy in Canada.

The truth is our universities are complicit of thought policing “free speech” in Canada... but, *whilst* the government monitors social media for *so-called* “hate speech” (i.e. “*anything opposed to Tavistockian programming*”) and passing laws like **Bill C-16** (to add *gender identity* and gender expression to the list of prohibited grounds of discrimination).

Protesters are being used as pawns to stop “freedom of speech” by exercising their right to freedom of assembly (because Cultural Marxism and passive-aggressive Frankfurter Schule totalitarianism fit the current agenda of dumbing-down the millennial masses, prioritizing an ever-increasing visible minority replacement population, and debasing relevant history with distractions, half-truths, feebly-veiled lies, and mass-produced pabulum for the immature minds of y^e compliant *goyishe kopf*).

University campuses like Laurier and Waterloo are hoping that groups like the LSOI simply feel defeated and just give up hosting events like “the unpopular opinions series”; but, like what Orwell said, If Liberty means anything at all it means the right to tell people what they do not want to hear.

In the decadent late stages of a society, bizarre and aberrant behavior becomes commonplace... so commonplace *that* the mass media subliminates we embrace their *mind-programming* and promote it as normal to do so and abnormal not to do so.

Then, on Wednesday, she said the price went from \$1600 for security to \$15,000... "as many have communicated their intent to protest, and there is a high risk of danger. We don’t have the money, so cancellation is likely."

Later Wednesday, she said the cost had ballooned to \$28,500 and the event was cancelled.

"There is no way we can pay that," she said.

UW president Feridun Hamdullahpur said in a statement the university "cannot shy away" from opposing views, but the university was just a venue for the talk and did not support the views of the speakers.

“Hey-hey... ho-ho...: White supremacy’s got to go!” the *gender-ambiguous speaker* yelled into the microphone. A little later I would be given two pieces of paper with a scribbled “**Fuck Nazis**” and someone would try to forcefully hand me a makeshift **Ku Klux Klan** robe.

I looked around the protest to see many familiar faces, such as professor **Greg Bird**, who had tweeted earlier in the day that free speech is a “ruse,” asking: **“Is Laurier a university or a Nazi recruitment centre?”**

The protest was a scene completely divorced from any kind of reality; all happening because the student group I lead, the **Laurier Society for Open Inquiry (LSOI)**, had invited far-right commentator and former Rebel Media personality **Faith Goldy** to give a talk and Q&A that evening about keeping Canada’s borders closed.

Originally, this event was supposed to be *a debate about immigration in Canada*—but every professor I invited to debate Goldy declined. One must wonder: if her arguments are so intellectually void and unreasonable, as critics claim, why was no one willing to take on her supposedly bunk arguments about White identity? Wouldn’t it be an easy win?

Running out of time and with no opposing speaker to represent the pro-open borders side, **LSOI** decided to launch the **Unpopular Opinions Speaker Series**, for which Goldy would be the inaugural speaker with her speech

“**Ethnocide: Multiculturalism and European-Canadian Identity.**”

The series would feature speakers who are strong and articulate, yet polemical—speakers who discuss subjects that most might consider taboo. A central tenet of this speaker series, we decided, would be a robust open floor Q&A session at the end, so that the presenter’s views could be directly challenged and confronted.

I had my own questions for Goldy planned: wouldn’t a theoretical “White ethnostate” be rather dull and homogenous? Doesn’t a diversity of cultures in Canada enhance our perceptions of the world and understanding of one another?

I never got to ask my questions.

In fact, I never even got to hear Goldy speak a single word on her topic, as protesters pulled the fire alarm while the introductory remarks were still being made. And that was that; event over.

We all evacuated the room. Goldy made a short statement at the park across the street, and we called it a night. The approximately 300 people who had shown up to hear her speak were let down.

After the controversy at **Wilfrid Laurier University** last fall—where I was disciplined as a teaching assistant for neutrally presenting a debate about gender pronouns in a first-year Communication Studies course—dozens of students reached out to me with their own experiences with political correctness and censorship on campus. It was clear that too many individuals were disenfranchised by the current campus climate that only permits a strict, one-sided social justice-oriented narrative; and from this realization, I decided to start LSOI. LSOI would endeavour to host speakers whose ideas would not be explored in the average university classroom, yet are worth intellectual inquiry.

I was bewildered back in the fall as to why my race was consistently being brought up by pundits, professors and PhD students who called me a “**crying White girl**” (I got emotional at times in the recorded disciplinary meeting I was subjected to) who is attempting to uphold some sort of White establishment under the guise of free speech.

I was accused of upholding **White supremacist logic** and *using my “White tears” to oppress minorities*. I wondered for months how my race was relevant to wanting to neutrally present the issue of genderless pronouns in my class.

However, throughout the **Faith Goldy** event pushback, it became clear to me why race was relevant to the free speech movement as a whole. It is usually the case that **free speech** is championed by those who see major flaws in the cultural condition. One of these current flaws is that if one is, in any way, to stand up to people who try to make disparaging remarks about White people or try to express any kind of pleasant sentiment towards **Western culture**, they will be [unjustly] labeled a **fascist White supremacist neo-Nazi** by the campus authoritarians who seem to derive a sick pleasure from controlling others through *claims of moral righteousness*.

Do I think Faith Goldy’s backstory is commendable? No. Appearing on a neo-Nazi podcast and reciting slogans associated with **Nazism** is distasteful, destructive to healthy race relations and completely deserving of harsh criticism.

What it means to be White in Canada today is one of those taboo topics that we must be able to openly talk about and question.

I had hoped Faith Goldy would spark that discussion and have her views openly and freely engaged with and deconstructed: this simple process is one of the very basic conditions of a liberal democracy. Instead, censorious campus activists silenced a much-needed discussion.

Nearly half of Canadians view Islam unfavourably

Even though Canada has been praised for its religious and culture diversity, almost half of Canadians view Islam in an unfavourable light compared to other faiths, according to a new survey. The Angus Reid Institute released results Tuesday on how Canadians view various faiths and religious symbolism in society. The study found that 46 % of Canadians view Islam and clothing associated with the religion unfavourably compared to how they view other religions to likes of Christianity and Buddhism. In terms of wearing religious grab in public, 88 % of those surveyed supported a person wearing the nun’s habit or a turban (77 %) compared to those wearing a niqab (32 %) or a burka (29 %). However, the survey noted that more people are beginning to view Islam in a more favourable light, with Quebec residents leading the way.

According to the survey, those in Quebec who say they view the Islam faith more favourably has more than doubled since 2009, jump from 15 % to 32 %. More Quebecers are also seeing Sikhism (32 %) and Hinduism (50 %) in a more positive light. The survey was conducted online between February 16 and 22, just over two weeks after Alexandre Bissonnette allegedly opened fire inside a Quebec City mosque killing six men during evening prayers.

Angus Reid Institute executive director Shachi Kurl suggested the deadly mosque attack may have contributed to an increase in support of the Muslim religion.

“Quebecers themselves were very shaken by the event, we did see leadership come out very quickly,” Kurl said. “We saw Premier Philippe Couillard, the mayor and others come out very strongly and say Muslims are Quebecers we are all in this together: Messages of harmony, messages of support and togetherness for the Muslim community.”

Couillard quickly condemned the attack, telling the Quebec’s Muslim community: “We are with you, this is your home, we are all Quebecers.”

As for the rest of Canada, the survey noted that one-in-three Canadians viewed Islam favourably, an increase compared to the Angus Reid Institute’s findings in the 2013, when only one quarter of Canadians viewed the faith in a favourable light. Christianity is still viewed the most favourably among 68 % of the survey respondents.

As for religion and marriage, the survey found only four % of Canadians would find it “unacceptable” for one of their children to marry a person who follows the Christian faith compared ot the 32 % who would oppose their son or daughter marrying a Muslim (32 %) or a Sikh (21 %.)

The Angus Reid Institute conducted an online survey from February 16 – 22, 2017, among a representative randomized sample of 1,515 Canadian adults who are members of the Angus Reid Forum. For comparison purposes only, a probability sample of this size would carry a margin of error of +/- 2.5 percentage points, 19 times out of 20. Discrepancies in or between totals are due to rounding.

Adam Frisk

© 2017 Global News, a division of Corus Entertainment Inc.

